

Robert P. Astorino  
County Executive

Office of the County Attorney

Robert F. Meehan  
County Attorney

April 23, 2013

David J. Kennedy  
Assistant United States Attorney  
U.S. Department of Justice  
Southern District of New York  
86 Chambers Street, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor  
New York, New York 10007

Re: *United States ex rel. Anti-Discrimination Center v.*  
*Westchester County*, 06 Civ. 2860 (DLC)(GWG)

Dear Mr. Kennedy:

This is in reply to your letter dated April 19, 2013.

I disagree with the contentions, arguments and characterizations in your letter.

The County is in compliance with the District Court's Order dated May 3, 2012 which has been affirmed by the Court of Appeals.

That Order adopted the Monitor's recommendation describing "the steps the County must take to comply with its obligation to promote source-of-income legislation" which are as follows:

"a reasonable interpretation of 'promotion' of legislation could encompass, at a minimum, requesting that the legislature reintroduce the prior legislation, providing information to assist in analyzing the impact of the legislation, and signing the legislation passed."

In his letter to the Board of Legislators dated April 10, 2013, the County Executive complied with each of the three directives set forth above. First, he requested that the Board of Legislators reintroduce "the prior source-of-income legislation that was passed by your Honorable Board in 2010." This very specifically identifies the legislation. Your contention that this is non-compliant because the County Executive did

not enclose a copy of this clearly identified legislation is wholly without merit and simply argumentative. Second, the County Executive's letter next says: "Also, in accordance with the Court's directive, I will provide information to assist in analyzing the impact of the legislation as needed and requested by your Honorable Board." Third, the County Executive states that upon action by the Board of Legislators, which obviously includes adoption of the source-of-income law, that he will "continue to comply with the District Court Order" which, as everyone knows, leaves no option for a veto.

Thus, the County Executive has not "failed to meet his obligations" as you contend. Your further argument that "the Board of Legislators [is left] uncertain as to what legislation the County Executive would sign" is belied by the facts that he specifically identified the 2010 legislation in his letter and stated that he will "continue to comply with the District Court Order."

Furthermore, you have distorted and taken the April 5<sup>th</sup> press release completely out of context. The statements therein were made in the context of explaining the County Executive's past objections to the source-of-income legislation before the Court's decision. Your argument seems to be that any open and honest discussion of historical facts is absolutely precluded.

Finally, a response to your demands on page 2 of your letter will be provided by Thursday, April 25, 2013 as requested.

Very truly yours,



Robert F. Meehan